UNITED
NATIONS

DP

Governing Council
of the United Nations
Development Programme

Distr.
GENERAL

DP/1992/SR.31
2 June 1992

Original: ENGLISH

GOVERNING COUNCIL

Thirty-ninth session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 31st MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 26 May 1992, at 4 p.m.

President: Mr. BREITENSTEIN (Finland)

CONTENTS

Report of the Standing Committee for Programme Matters

Report of the Budgetary and Finance Committee

Report of the Drafting Group

Programme-level activities (continued):

(d) Human development report (continued)

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Official Records Editing Section, room E.4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

Any corrections to the records of the meetings of this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

GE.92-71238/4539B

CONTENTS (continued)

Other matters (continued):

(a) Venue of sessions of the Governing Council (continued)

(c) Commonwealth of Independent States and Eastern Europe: ways of establishing a United Nations presence (continued)

Other reports and documents considered by the Governing Council

Closure of the session

The meeting was called to order at 4.45 p.m.

REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME MATTERS
(DP/1992/SCPM/L.11/Add.19 and Corr.1, DP/1992/L.16-L.18, L.20 and L.21)

1. Mr. ADOUKI (Congo), speaking as Chairman of the Standing Committee for Programme Matters, said that the Committee had considered 62 country programmes, 49 extensions, and 8 global projects relating to 7 countries. The Committee had also considered 31 UNFPA country programmes, and a number of other issues, the whole constituting a truly enormous task. The Committee's recommendations were set forth in draft decisions I and II, contained in document DP/1992/SCPM/L.11/Add.19 and Corr.1, and in draft decisions DP/1992/L.16-L.18, L.20 and L.21.

2. In draft decision I, the Committee recommended that the Governing Council approve the country programmes for 56 countries and the Caribbean multi-island country programme. Council approval of the Fifth country programme for Malawi was also recommended, on the understanding that the conditions stipulated in subparagraphs (a) and (b) of section II of the draft decision were adhered to. The Committee also recommended that the Governing Council should take note of the extension by one year of the country programmes for 45 countries and the Regional Programme for Arab States and should approve the extension by two years of the country programmes for three countries.

3. The Committee further proposed that the Governing Council should take note of the regional programmes for Africa, Asia and the Pacific, Europe and Latin America and the Caribbean.

4. In section VII of draft decision I, the Committee recommended that the Governing Council should approve the following global and interregional projects: children's health research programme, human reproductive health programme, special programme for research and training on tropical diseases, creation of new substainable varieties of cassava plant, reducing maize losses, biotechnology-assisted breeding, genetic improvement of farmed Tilapia, global Musa testing programme, and the global and interregional programmes for the fifth programming cycle 1992-1996.

5. The Committee further recommended that the Governing Council should approve the SPR programming document on the social dimensions of adjustment, contained in document DP/1992/52/Add.1, and authorize the Administrator to approve projects on a case-by-case basis in Afghanistan, Cambodia, Haiti, Kuwait, Lebanon and Liberia.

6. In draft decision II, the Standing Committee recommended that the Governing Council approve UNFP country programmes for 31 countries.

7. In the context of its consideration of agenda items 6, 8 and 9, the Committee decided to recommend that the Governing Council adopt the draft decisions set forth in documents DP/1992/L.16, L.17, L.18, L.20 and L.21, relating to Myanmar, evaluation, programme approach, country programming and mid-term reviews, and Yugoslavia, respectively.

8. Mr. BLAIN (Secretary of the Standing Committee for Programme Matters) drew the Council's attention to the following changes to document DP/1992/SCPM/L.11/Add.19. On page 5, section II, the words "for the full five-year period" in the chapeau should be deleted, and in subparagraph (b), the words "(possibly on the lines of ...)" should be replaced by "(in the form of ...)". On page 7, the last entry under "Europe" should be deleted, together with the corresponding symbol. On page 8, section IV, the chapeau should be revised in accordance with DP/1992/SCPM/L.11/Add.19/Corr.1. On page 9, section V, after "Latin America and the Caribbean" an insertion should be made as indicated in DP/1992/SCPM/L.11/Add.19/Corr.1.

9. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council might wish to approve all the draft decisions simultaneously, i.e. those contained in documents DP/1992/SCPM/L.11/Add.19 and Corr.1, as orally revised, and those in documents DP/1992/L.16, L.17, L.18, L.20 and L.21.

10. It was so decided.

11. The draft decisions recommended by the Standing Committee for Programme Matters were adopted unanimously.

12. The PRESIDENT said that the Council had thus completed its consideration of the report of the Standing Committee on Programme Matters.

REPORT OF THE BUDGETARY AND FINANCE COMMITTEE (DP/1992/BFC/L.1 and Add.1 and Annex, Add.2 and Annex, Add.3 and Annex, Add.4 and Annex, and Add.5-7; DP/1992/BFC/L.3 and Add.1-3)

13. Mr. SENILOLI (Fiji), speaking as Chairman of the Budgetary and Finance Committee, said that the most important items on the Committee's agenda were the review of the annual financial situation of both UNDP and UNFPA, and the UNDP proposed budget strategy for 1994-1995, which had been given a particularly thorough review in both formal and informal sessions. Another related budget and finance issue, referred to the Committee during the course of the session, was the issue of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) and Eastern Europe, on which agreement had been reached in a most cooperative and professional manner.

14. Ms. DOWSETT (New Zealand), speaking as Rapporteur of the Budgetary and Finance Committee, said that the Council had before it for its consideration various recommendations contained in documents DP/1992/BFC/L.2/Add.5 and Add.6 and annexes to L.2/Add.1 to Add.4 inclusive. The Committee's final report would be issued as document DP/1992/69.

15. Most of the approved amendments to the Committee's recommendations were contained in document DP/1992/BFC/L.3 and Add.1 and 2. Some amendments had been approved after the Committee had concluded its deliberations, but had not been included due to lack of time. As Rapporteur, she had been entrusted with the task of finalizing the summary report of the discussions based on final inputs from delegations, a task which she hoped that the Council would, in its turn, authorize.

16. Document DP/1992/BFC/L.2/Add.1, as amended by paragraphs 1 to 4 of DP/1992/BFC/L.3/Add.1, contained the report of the discussions in the Budgetary and Finance Committee on UNFPA financial, budgetary and administrative matters under agenda item 7. Document DP/1992/BFC/L.2/Add.1/Annex, as amended by paragraphs 5 to 10 of DP/1992/BFC/L.3/Add.1, contained the BFC recommendations on the same agenda item.

17. Document DP/1992/BFC/L.2/Add.2, as amended by DP/1992/BFC/L.3, contained the report of the discussions in the BFC on the annual review of the financial situation, 1991, under agenda item 10 (a). Document DP/1992/BFC/L.2/Add.2/Annex, as amended by DP/1992/BFC/L.3/Add.2, contained the recommendations of the BFC on that agenda item.

18. Document DP/1992/BFC/L.2/Add.3, as amended by DP/1992/BFC/L.3/Add.2, contained the report of the discussions in the BFC on the revised budget estimates for 1992-1993 and budget strategy for 1994-1995, under agenda item 10 (b). The recommendations of the BFC on that item, with amendments agreed upon in the BFC at its last meeting to be subsequently incorporated, would be issued as DP/1992/BFC/L.2/Add.3/Annex and DP/1992/BFC/L.3/Add.3 respectively.

19. Document DP/1992/BFC/L.2/Add.4, as amended by DP/1992/BFC/L.3, contained the report of the discussions in the BFC on audit reports under agenda item 10 (c). Document DP/1992/BFC/L.2/Add.4/Annex contained the recommendations of the BFC on that agenda item.

20. Document DP/1992/BFC/L.2/Add.5, as amended by paragraphs 11 to 18 of DP/1992/BFC/L.3/Add.1, together with a further revision approved by the BFC at its last meeting and to be subsequently incorporated, contained the report and recommendations of the BFC on the status of management services under agenda item 10 (d).

21. Document DP/1992/BFC/L.2/Add.6 contained the report and recommendations of the BFC on financial regulations: matters on which consensus had not yet been reached under agenda item 10 (e).

22. When considering the items before it, and especially the revised budget estimates, the Committee had also taken into account a number of documents and related plenary decisions dealing with various matters, namely, documents DP/1992/19, 22, 37 and Add.1, 45 and 51.

23. In addition to the recommendations made by the Budgetary and Finance Committee for adoption by the Council at its thirty-ninth session, agenda item 11 (c), namely, the Commonwealth of Independent States and Eastern Europe: ways of establishing a United Nations presence, had also been referred to the BFC, taken up and discussed, and recommendations had been made on the relevant budgetary paragraphs. It had then been referred back to the Council for incorporation into the main decision on that item.

24. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should authorize the Rapporteur to incorporate into the final report of the Budgetary and Finance Committee the amendments approved by the Committee but not taken up in the documents currently before it.

25. It was so decided.

26. The draft decisions recommended by the Budgetary and Finance Committee were adopted unanimously.

27. The PRESIDENT said that the Council had thus completed its consideration of the report of the Budgetary and Finance Committee.

REPORT OF THE DRAFTING GROUP (DP/1992/L.13 and Add.1-17)

28. The PRESIDENT invited the Governing Council to consider the draft decisions submitted by the Drafting Group in documents DP/1992/L.13/Add.1-17.

DP/1992/L.13/Add.1-15

29. The draft decisions contained in documents DP/1992/L.13/Add.1-15 were adopted.

DP/1992/L.13/Add.16

30. Mr NEAGU (Romania), speaking as Chairman of the Drafting Group, said that, in the heading between operative paragraphs 15 and 16 of the draft decision on national execution and agency support costs (DP/1992/L.13/Add.16), the word "support" should be added between "operational" and "services". The same addition should be made in the fourth line of operative paragraph 16 and the second line of operative paragraph 18.

31. The draft decision on national execution and agency support costs (DP/1992/L.13/Add.16), as orally revised, was adopted.

The meeting was suspended at 5.45 p.m. and resumed at 6.10 p.m.

DP/1992/L.13/Add.17

32. The draft decision on senior management structure (DP/1992/L.13/Add.17) was adopted.

33. The PRESIDENT said that the Governing Council had thus completed its consideration of the draft decisions submitted by the Drafting Group.

PROGRAMME-LEVEL ACTIVITIES (agenda item 3) (continued)

(d) HUMAN DEVELOPMENT REPORT (continued)

34. The PRESIDENT said that the informal consultations on the Human Development Report 1992 had remained inconclusive. There was a lack of consensus among the members, especially with regard to the area of political freedom and human development, and the Governing Council was thus unable to adopt a decision on the matter.

35. Mr. FERNANDEZ de COSSIO-DOMINGUEZ (Cuba) said that his delegation had hoped that the Governing Council would be able to reach a decision on the issue of human development, and had therefore associated itself with the communication on the issue which the Chairman of the Group of 77 had addressed to the Administrator on 30 April 1992.

36. The irresponsible intrusion of UNDP into an issue on which it had no mandate had led to a regrettable division among its member States. Following lengthy negotiations, it had appeared likely that agreement could have been reached on a recommendation to the effect that work on the issue of human development should be continued, but with a warning that the issue was of a politically sensitive nature which was outside UNDP's terms of reference. Nevertheless, a group of delegations had preferred to thwart the explicit will of the majority of members of the Council.

37. His delegation wished to emphasize that the lack of agreement did not mean that UNDP was authorized to continue its work in that field and to continue publishing the human development reports.

38. Mr. ITURRIAGA (Observer for Mexico) said that his delegation was most disappointed that, notwithstanding intense negotiations, the Governing Council had been unable to reach agreement regarding the future work of UNDP on the human development reports. The lack of agreement clearly demonstrated the contentious nature of those activities and the fact that there was no consensus for UNDP to become involved in matters of a political nature which fell within the domestic competence of the individual States.

39. A fundamental principle of UNDP was that all its activities should be based on consensus. The discussion had shown once again that most States were opposed to UNDP becoming involved in risky and undesirable political processes that were outside its original mandate as an agency for technical cooperation for development.

40. His delegation interpreted the lack of agreement on the issue as a clear indication that UNDP should abstain from any attempt to qualify or quantify the performance of its member States in matters of internal policy. Point 3 of the document addressed by the Chairman of the Group of 77 to the Administrator exactly reflected his Government's position.

41. His delegation was prepared to participate in efforts to achieve a unanimous definition of the basis on which UNDP, within its mandate, could continue its activities for the promotion of integral human development. In the meantime, it was sure that UNDP would carry out its important function of technical assistance in conformity with its mandate and on a consensus basis.

42. Mr. MESTRE SARMIENTO (Observer for Colombia), referring to the communication of the Chairman of the Group of 77 to the Administrator, said that the lack of consensus could not be interpreted as an unlimited authorization for the Administrator to continue work on the human development reports. On the contrary, the disagreements among the members of the Governing Council gave clear evidence of the illegitimacy of the said publication until the member States had reached agreement on the guidelines which the General Assembly had requested.

43. UNDP would lose its credibility which was based on its neutrality and universality, if it continued to insist on indicators which were only apparently independent and ignored the complexity and political dimension of the problem and its impact on the enjoyment of human rights. Such issues were the responsibility of other United Nations organs, which operated under previously agreed procedures which permitted the participation of the countries under consideration, thus according legitimacy to the conclusions reached. Such legitimacy could not attach to a decision reached by an independent consultant without the participation of the States concerned.

44. Mr. NIE Hualiang (China) said that his delegation, which regretted that it had not been possible to reach a consensus at the current session of the Governing Council, took the view that the policy problems referred to in the human development reports went far beyond the mandate of UNDP. In the circumstances, it believed that the issue should be submitted to a more appropriate forum, with a view to finding a solution through in-depth consultations. It would be inappropriate for UNDP to continue to work on the political problems concerned.

45. Mr. ORTIZ (Observer for Chile) said that the lack of consensus on the issue was a signal to UNDP that it must restrict its activities to its mandate and avoid matters of concern to other United Nations bodies.

46. Mr. RADE (Netherlands) said that, in his delegation's view, the team that produced the human development reports was an independent one. In view of the lack of consensus in the Governing Council on guidelines for its future work, the team was entirely free to publish whatever it considered appropriate.

47. Mr. OSELLA (Observer for Argentina) said that his delegation regretted the Council's inability to agree on a draft resolution on the interrelationship between the factors that affected development. The methodological problem of the relationship between development and freedom in no way diminished the importance of UNDP's work on human development, and his delegation thought that the Programme should continue its analysis of the interrelationship between the various development components.

48. Mr. MARKS (United States of America) said that the discussion of the past two weeks was the continuation of intensive negotiations begun earlier in the year. Nearly all delegations had demonstrated a great willingness to deal with the question seriously and to agree on the instructions which the Governing Council should give to UNDP concerning the pursuit of the work it had begun in the human-development area, particularly the question of the interrelationship between political freedom and human development. Nearly all delegations had agreed that human development was more than a question of economic growth and that human freedom and political development constituted an important part of the overall development of society and peoples.

49. It was on that basis that UNDP had begun its important work of exploring the link between political freedom and development, work that his delegation enthusiastically supported. Unfortunately, it had not been possible to achieve a consensus, but his delegation looked forward to continuing the dialogue elsewhere with all those concerned.

50. Mr. MACHIN (United Kingdom) said that his delegation fully supported the comments made by the representatives of the Netherlands and the United States.

51. Mr. Y. ZAINUDDIN (Malaysia) said the fact that a consensus on human rights and political freedom continued to elude the Council showed the complexity of the issue and its importance to Governments. The majority of developing countries had suggested that the issue should be dealt with in the appropriate organ of the United Nations system and no representative of a developing country had opposed the idea of discussing it within the United Nations.

52. The members of the Council should continue their efforts to find a solution, so that an approach which would be relevant to the work of the UNDP could be elaborated. However, any attempt to quantify the performance of Governments in the field of political freedom in the absence of an internationally acceptable standard of measurement could not but complicate the consultation process and place UNDP and the multilateral cooperation it represented in a questionable light.

53. His delegation welcomed the fact that the human development report team had held consultations with Member States the previous year and looked forward to similar consultations during the current year with a view to improving the content and relevance of the future reports.

54. Mr. KOIKE (Japan) said his delegation regretted that it had not been possible to reach an agreement in the Governing Council on the human development reports and to give clear guidance concerning the future work on such reports.

55. There were two points he wished to make. In the first place, UNDP was part of the United Nations and had a specific mandate and responsibility with the United Nations system. Secondly, the human development report was a UNDP publication, not an academic exercise, and the Administrator had to assume the ultimate responsibility for the contents of the report. UNDP should continue its work on the relationship between human development and political freedom, bearing those two points in mind.

56. Mr. RAHARDJO (Indonesia) said that, since the Council had been unable to reach a consensus, UNDP should not continue its work on the substantive part of human development but should confine itself to productive work carried out in accordance with its mandate to promote technical cooperation for development. The Programme's involvement in controversial areas could jeopardize its neutral and non-political nature, which constituted its greatest asset and main comparative advantage.

57. Mr. BLANK (Germany) said that his delegation believed that a consensus needed to be achieved because of the relationship between development and human freedom, referred to by the representative of Argentina. The independent team must be allowed to continue its work, and his delegation therefore fully endorsed the comments made by the representatives of the Netherlands, the United States and the United Kingdom.

58. Mr. SEED (New Zealand) said that, despite the efforts made by all delegations, it had not been possible to reach an agreement. However, it was encouraging that there had been some movement in the right direction.

59. He commended UNDP on its innovative work over the past two years in exploring issues having an impact on human development. His delegation considered that there was a link between aid effectiveness and participation and between government accountability and good governance and that they formed an appropriate area of research for the United Nations principal development agency.

60. His delegation recognized that there was genuine concern about the methodology used in formulating part of the Human Development Report 1992. It also noted that that concern had been acknowledged by UNDP. In its view, UNDP should continue that work, with due regard for the views expressed by the various delegations. His Government hoped that UNDP's future work in that area would help all States to improve the effectiveness of their development efforts.

61. Mr. HOLTHE (Norway) said his delegation, which had been closely associated with the last-minute efforts made, regretted that it had not proved possible to reach a consensus. He was sure that, given the spirit of compromise shown by everyone, a solution would be found before the forthcoming session of the General Assembly.

62. Mr. FERNANDEZ-PITA (Spain) said that there was no question that development involved much more than economic growth. The differences that had arisen in the Council related solely to the formulation of the relationship between freedom and development and the methodology used. His delegation was ready to continue working with other delegations in the Council and elsewhere to refine the methodology within the framework of UNDP's competence.

63. Mr. OULD CHEIKH EL GHAOUTH (Mauritania), supported by Mr. MSHILA (Observer for Kenya), said that the Administrator should regard the regrettable lack of agreement as an indication that UNDP should discontinue its work on an issue which tended to divide the members of UNDP. Instead of debating political matters, the Council should concentrate on UNDP's priority task, namely, helping the poor nations to develop.

64. Mr. CARMICHAEL (Canada) said that his delegation was prepared to continue participating in efforts to develop a consensus on the issue. It took the view that the human development report team was an independent one that should continue its work of exploring and analysing all the factors relevant to development. His delegation considered the Human Development Report 1992 to be an important tool in promoting understanding and support for the complex process of development.

65. Mr. BELL (India) said that there were two issues at stake. The first was the question of the independence of the team, to which several delegations had referred. In his own delegation's view, a publication bearing the UNDP symbol could not be outside the purview of the Governing Council. Such a report was necessarily published on the responsibility of UNDP.

66. Secondly, he wished to stress that the lack of consensus related solely to the methodology used in compiling the human-freedom index, general agreement having been reached on all other issues relating to the Human Development Report 1992.

67. Mr. MARKER (Denmark) said his delegation noted that no consensus had been reached on limiting the activities of the human development report team.

68. Mr. TANTOT (France) said that the fact that it had not proved possible to reach an agreement on the central issue in question was an additional reason for the human development report team to continue its efforts, taking into account all the relevant information and the views expressed in the Council.

69. Mr. ALOM (Observer for Bangladesh) said that his delegation wished to put on record its regret at the lack of consensus on the Human Development Report 1992.

70. Miss FEROUKHI (Algeria) said that her delegation, which fully agreed with the views expressed in the letter sent by the Chairman of the Group of 77 to the Administrator noted that some progress had been made with regard to the positions of many delegations, including those of the developed countries.

71. Mr. FONDI (Italy) said that his delegation endorsed the comments made by the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom and Canada.

72. Mr. NDANUSA (Nigeria) said his delegation agreed with those speakers who maintained that UNDP should suspend publication of the Human Development Report until a consensus had been reached.

73. Mr. AFANASIEV (Russian Federation) said that the human development reports must adopt a balanced approach and take account of the national circumstances of the various countries. That being said, the Human Development Report 1992 merited serious attention and study and his delegation was prepared to discuss it at future sessions of UNDP and of other bodies.

74. Mr. AMORIN (Uruguay) said that his delegation, which agreed with the letter sent by the Chairman of the Group of 77 to the Administrator, thought that the Human Development Report 1992 was an improvement on the previous one and relfected some of the concerns expressed by developing countries. He hoped that the human development report team would ensure that its next report took account of the substantial differences that existed concerning the treatment of certain subjects. The Council might indicate in its own report which subjects should not be dealt with.

75. Mr. ROHNER (Switzerland) and Mr. TRAXL (Austria) said that their delegations, which strongly supported the work being done by UNDP in the area under consideration and hoped that it would be continued, were confident that a consensus would be reached in the near future and would do their best to contribute to that end.

76. Mr. DOSS (Observer for Egypt) said that, if UNDP were to continue its work in the area of human development before a consensus was reached, it would be exceeding its mandate and flouting the will of many of its member States.

77. Mr. BARREIROS (Portugal) said that, although his Government did not agree with everything in the Human Development Report 1992, it regarded it as a very important instrument which had brought UNDP to the forefront of the human development debate. UNDP and the human development report team should therefore continue their work.

78. Mr. SENE (Observer for Senegal) said that his delegation much regretted the controversy caused by the Human Development Report 1992, especially since UNDP had been one of the first United Nations bodies to incorporate human development into its work. The Council should therefore continue its dialogue in order to reach the consensus needed to enable UNDP to contribute as it should to the relaunching of economic growth and progress in human rights and fundamental freedoms. Future reports should avoid the sort of classification that had disturbed some Governments.

79. Mr. VAN LANDUYT (Belgium), Ms. SUOMALAINEN (Finland), and Mr. LUNDBORG (Observer for Sweden) endorsed the views of those speakers who had given their full support to the Human Development Report and wished UNDP to continue publishing it.

80. Mr. MAKOETJE (Lesotho) said that his delegation would continue to work towards a consensus on the issue. In the meantime, UNDP should cease its activities in areas in which other organizations had comparative advantages.

81. Mr. MOUSSA (Cameroon), said that the Administrator should take the lack of a consensus as a warning not to continue with certain development activities. The Human Development Report 1992 contained many positive elements, but it had also addressed itself to a number of sensitive matters which were outside the competence of UNDP.

82. The PRESIDENT said that the clear desire of all delegations to reach a consensus had been apparent throughout the discussion. He suggested, therefore, that the meeting should be suspended so that consultations could be held in a last attempt to reach a consensus.

83. After a procedural discussion in which Mr. ITURRIAGA (Observer for Mexico), Mr. MARKS (United States of America), Mr. NDANUSA (Nigeria), and Mr. ADOUKI (Congo) took part, the PRESIDENT withdrew his suggestion that the meeting be suspended to allow for further discussion and said that consultations on the issue would be resumed in New York.

OTHER MATTERS (agenda item 11) (continued)

(a) VENUE OF SESSIONS OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL (continued) (DP/1992/L.23)

84. The PRESIDENT recalled that, following formal discussions on the venue in the plenary meetings, the item had been referred for further consideration through informal consultations between the parties most directly concerned with the issue. As a result of those consultations, a draft decision (DP/1992/L.23) had been produced for submission to the Council.

85. The draft decision on the venue of sessions of the Governing Council (DP/1992/L.23) was adopted.

(c) THE COMMONWEALTH OF INDEPENDENT STATES AND EASTERN EUROPE: WAYS OF ESTABLISHING A UNITED NATIONS PRESENCE (continued) (DP/1992/L.19)

86. The PRESIDENT recalled that, after the formal discussion of the sub-item in the Council, informal consultations had been inaugurated to prepare a draft decision thereon.

87. Mr. BARNETT (United Kingdom), speaking as coordinator of the informal consultations, said that the draft decision (DP/1992/L.19) covered the question of the role and presence of UNDP in the Baltic States and the Commonwealth of Independent States and the appropriation of a budgetary envelope for UNDP's activities in that regard. During the consultations, emphasis had been placed on the need to ensure that UNDP's work in the region was integrated with that of other multilateral and bilateral donors. All participants in the consultations had expressed their full agreement with the draft decision.

88. He wished to make a change in the text. The change which had been approved by all the participants was purely one of form and involved no change of substance. Operative paragraph 5 should be divided into two parts to read:

> "5. Invites the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly at their 1992 sessions to examine ways of ensuring such an integrated approach and integrated presence;
>
> "6. Further invites the governing bodies of relevant United Nations specialized agencies and funds to contribute to this process;".

The subsequent paragraphs would be renumbered accordingly.

89. The draft decision on the activities of the United Nations Development Programme in the Baltic States and the Commonwealth of Independent States (DP/1992/L.19), as orally revised was adopted.

90. Mr. AFANASIEV (Russian Federation), supported by Mr. BLUKIS (Observer for Latvia) on behalf of the Baltic States, expressed his gratitude to all those delegations which had adopted a sympathetic attitude to the request made by the CIS countries and the Baltic States for recipient status with UNDP.

OTHER REPORTS AND DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED BY THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

91. The PRESIDENT said that there were a number of reports submitted to the Council on which no specific decisions had been taken. They were: the Annual Report of the Administrator for 1991 (DP/1992/12/Add.1 and Add.2-6); the Administrator's report on micro-capital grants (DP/1992/60/16); the Administrator's report on United Nations system regular and extrabudgetary technical cooperation expenditures (DP/1991/69) and the Administrator's report on the status of management services (DP/1992/43). If he heard no objection, he would assume that the Council wished to take note of those reports.

92. It was so decided.

CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

93. Mr. DRAPER (Administrator, United Nations Development Programme) said that the Council's thirty-ninth session had been a historic one: the high-level segment had discussed ideas for the reform and restructuring of the United Nations system for development cooperation in preparation for the next session of the Economic and Social Council, eight new members had been admitted to recipient status, and the Council was ending its session three days ahead of time. The session had been attended by the delegations of 62 countries and representatives of 15 agencies.

94. The Council had approved 63 UNDP and 31 UNFPA country programmes and had extended others. It had also addressed some of the key concerns of current global economic and human development, including population, the environment, the HIV/AIDS pandemic, programmes of humanitarian assistance and the new agenda for the development of Africa in the 1990s. The Council had also made progress on a number of issues essential for the management of UNDP and its programmes.

95. The strong debate and lack of consensus on the Human Development Report 1992, had not marred the success of the session, which was largely due to the high quality and positive nature of the contributions of all delegations. He would be reporting to the General Assembly later in the year about the efforts made to streamline documentation and the agenda and meetings of the Governing Council.

96. After an exchange of courtesies, the PRESIDENT declared the session closed.

The meeting rose at 8.15 p.m.